DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 078 UD 021 659

AUTHOR Wong, Morrison G.; Hirschman, Charles
TITLE The New Asian Immigrants.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE [79]
GRANT 1-R01-HD-14337-01
NOTE 30p.; Some tables may be marginally legible due to small size type.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; *Demography; *Employment Level; Employment Patterns; *Immigrants; *Migration Patterns; Public Policy; Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS Immigration and Nationality Act 1965

ABSTRACT

In the early 1960s, Asian immigration to the United States was severely limited. The passage of the Immigration Act of 1965 expanded Asian immigration and ended a policy of racial discrimination and exclusion. Currently, over one third of the total immigrant population to the United States is from Asia, particularly China, Japan, Korea, the Philipines, and India. An analysis of Immigration and Naturalization Service data indicated that: (1) Asian immigration to the United States has increased approximately 600 percent since the early 1960s; (2) the majority of Asian immigrants are admitted under the preference system, especially the relative preference category; (3) the age and sex composition of the Asian immigrant population have remained relatively stable since the early 1960s, though trends vary among Asian groups; and (4) Asian immigrants are about twice as likely to be professional and technical workers than are immigrants from elsewhere. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUL 22 1981

ED208078

THE NEW ASIAN IMMIGRANTS

by

Morrison G. Wong
Department of Sociology
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

and

Charles Hirschman
Department of Sociology
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Morrison G. Wong
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

us 21659

This research was made possible by a National Institue of Child Health and Human Development Grant (1-RO1-HD-14337-01). The authors wish to thank Linda Gordon and Steven Schroffel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Steve Couch of the Smithsonian Institution for their valuable assistanee and Teresa Dark for typing the manuscript.

ABSTRACT

THE NEW ASIAN IMMIGRANTS

In the early 1960s, Asian immigration to the United States had been limited to a small trickle. The passage of the Immigration Act of 1965 opened the doors to Asian immigration and ended a policy of racial discrimination and exclusion. Currently, over one third of the total immigration population to the United States is from Asia, particularly from China (including Taiwan and Hong Kong), Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and India. A brief history of United States immigration policy is presented in order to emphasize the impact the reform Immigration Act of 1965 had on Asian immigration. Analysis of the INS data indicates the following changes: (1) Asian immigration to the United States has increased about 600 percent from its early 1960 figure. (2) The majority of Asian immigrants are admitted under the preference system, especially the relative preference category, indicating the development of a family chain pattern of migration. (3) The age and sex composition of Asian immigration have remained relatively stable though trends differ among Asian groups. (4) Asian immigrants are about twice as likely to be profession and technical workers than immigrants from elsewhere. The consequences of this tremendous influx of Asian immigrants to the United States is presented, not only for the larger society, but also for the indigenous Asian Communities.

INTRODUCTION

Following the communist victory in Vietnam in the spring of 1975, more than 130,000 Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees entered the United States. The Indochina exodus has continued and the United States had admitted over 200,000 refugees by the middle of 1979. With the continuing human tragedy of the "boat people" in Southeast Asia these numbers will surely increase. Behind the headlines of the Vietnamese refugees, there is an equally significant process of new immigration to the United States from other Asian countries, including Korea, China (including Taiwan and Hong Kong), the Philippines, and India. In the early 1960s, only about 7 percent of all immigrants, about 20,000 per year, came from Asia. But by the middle 1970s, more than one-third of all legal immigrants to the United States, almost 150,000 per year, were arriving from Asia. These figures exclude the Indochina refugees because they were admitted under "parole status" outside of the normal immigration process. In this paper, we will review the background of the new Asian immigration to the United States during the last decade and describe the changes in the numbers and characteristics of immigrants from specific Asian countries relative to other immigrants. Finally, we will speculate on the possible consequences of this new Asian immigration on American society.

UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION POLICY TOWARD ASIA

As flows between nations, international migration has almost always been subject to legal restrictions of one kind or another. Both the historical barriers that limited Asian immigration to the United States and the turn-around of the last decade arose from shifts in United States policies. While the reforms of the Immigration Act of 1965 put all countries on a relatively equal footing, previous United States immigration policy favored whites above other races, and northwestern European groups above all.

United States immigration policy toward Asia is a classic case of racial exclusion, predating the restrictive legislation of the 1920s by several decades. Immigration to the United States from China reached significant levels in the middle of the nineteenth century, with most Chinese immigrants settling on the West Coast (Lyman, 1974). After several decades of anti-Chinese agitation inspired by real or imagined competition with white workers and racist propaganda (Sandmeyer, 1973; Saxton, 1971), Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 which sharply curtailed further labor immigration from China. Originally intended to be terminated after ten years, the Act was renewed in 1892 and made a permanent feature of the United States policy in 1904 (Kung, 1962). Small numbers of Chinese immigrants, usually around 1,000-2,000 continued to arrive in the United States during the first several decades of the twentieth century under special provisions (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975: 107).

A similar fate was experienced by Japanese immigrants a few decades later. Japanese immigration was encouraged by West Coast business as a source of cheap labor during the last decade of the 19th and first decade of the 20th century. But anti-Japanese sentiments were fanned by white workers whose wage levels were undercut by the new immigrants. Thus, Japanese immigration was reduced to much lower levels with the "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1908, whereby Japan limited migration to the United States to only nonlaborers (Daniels, 1970).

Filipinos were the third major Asian group to immigrate to the United States. Like the Japanese before them, many first immigrated to Hawaii to work on the sugar and pineapple plantations. During the 1920s Filipino migration to the United States (mainland) gained momentum, coming directly from the Philippines or indirectly through Hawaii (Burma, 1951; Daniels and Kitano, 1970). Because Filipinos were nationals of the United States, there were no legal restrictions placed on them and they were not subject to quota restrictions. However, in 1934,

the Tydings-McDuffie Act (Filipino Exclusion Act) was passed which placed an "alien" status on Filipinos and hence restricted Filipino immigration to fifty persons per year. In 1946, an immigration quota of 100 persons was established for Filipino immigrants (Christiansen, 1979).

The Immigration Act of 1924 reinforced the racist and exclusionistic immigration policies of the United States toward all immigrants, especially those of Asian ancestry. (For a more detailed review of Asian immigration, see Hune, 1977.)

The Immigration and Nationality Act (McCarran-Walter) of 1952 was more of a rationalization of existing immigration policy than a reform. For the Eastern Hemisphere, including Asia, there were two routes of immigration through the "quota" or the "non-quota" system. Non-quota immigration was only for immediate relatives (spouses, children, parents) of United States citizens and other selected cases. Wives of United States servicemen stationed abroad were a typical case of immigration exempt from the quota system. The quota system followed the national origins restrictions of the 1924 legislation with only token quotas for Asians: 105 for China, 185 for Japan, and 100 each for India and the Philippines (the minimum).

The Immigration Act of 1965 provided the first real reform of immigration policy in the 20th century. The national origins quotas which favored immigrants from northwestern Europe were abolished and each country was put on an equal footing. The principle of family reunification and the emphasis of scarce occupational skills became the major criteria for the admission of immigrants. The preference system of the 1965 Act (see Table 1) was used to select the 170,000 immigrants allowed under the numerical ceilings. Aside from a limit of 20,000 immigrants annually from any single country, no country was given preference under the new system. In addition to the 170,000 spouses from the Eastern Hemisphere under these preferences, immediate relatives (parents and children

below the age of 21) of United States citizens were exempt from numerical limitations. The new preference system of the 1965 Act was phased in from 1966 to 1968, providing for an adjustment period from the old McCarran-Walter period. During this transition period, unused visas from undersubscribed countries were allotted to other countries with a large waiting list. Beginning in 1969 immigrant visas were to be distributed without preference to any country.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

THE IMPACT OF THE REFORM IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

The reforms of the 1965 Immigration Act have had important consequences for American society at large and especially for specific ethnic-nationality communities in the United States (Keely, 1971; 1974; 1975a; 1975b). Perhaps the most significant consequences were the sharp increase in the number of Asian immigrants to the United States and the corresponding decrease in the number of European immigrants. Under previous legislation, including the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, the number of Asian immigrants was limited to a small trickle. But with the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act, the number of Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Indians, and Filipinos rose dramatically (Boyd, 1971; 1974). "The Asian Pacific triangle was immediately abolished and, with it, the last vestiges of a policy which discriminated against those of Asian birth or ancestry." (Keely, 1975b)

Figure 1 About Here

Figure 1 graphically illustrates the impact of the 1965 Immigration Act on annual immigration for selected European and Asian countries. Using these countries as representative of European and Asian migration trends, we

note a reversal of roles of Europe and Asia as contributors to the immigrant flow to the United States. During the McCarran-Walter period, European countries were the major contributors of immigrants to the United States (42%). However, in recent years (1975-1977), only about 17 percent of the immigration came from Europe. Note that the recent annual number of immigrants from Germany, the United Kingdom, and Italy is lower than before the enactment of the 1965 Immigration Act. Asian immigration, on the other hand, has experienced a phenomenial increase since the McCarran-Walter days. Though limited to a small trickle in the early 1960s, present Asian immigration accounts for about 35 percent of the total legal immigration to the United States.

Except for 1975-76 when more than 130,000 Vietnamese were admitted to the United States under the conditional status (as refugees), Asian immigration to the United States has largely gone unnoticed by the larger society. This may be partly due to the small proportion of Asians in the United States (about 1 percent of the total United States population in 1970) and their geographical segregation in certain west coast cities (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). However, in terms of sheer numbers, the influx of migrants from Korea, China, and the Philippines for the 1975-1977 period has been equally as high as that of the Vietnamese.

The Number of Asian Immigrants

In order to measure the impact of the 1965 Immigration Act on the sources of immigration to the United States, Table 2 presents data on the numbers of immigrants by region of birth (specific countries within Asia) and percentage change between five time periods: (1) The last five years under the McCarran-Walter (Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952) regulations (1961-1965); (2) The three-year transition period[1] in which the quota system was phased out (1966-1968); (3-5) The three successive three-year periods (1969-1971, 1972-1974,

1975-1977) when the policies of the Act were fully in effect.

The annual number of immigrants to the United States has steadily increased with each subsequent period (from 290,000 to 416,000 immigrants). (The annual average figure of 380,000 persons for the 1966-1968 period is actually inflated due to the inclusion of 99,312 Cuban refugees who had their parole status adjusted to immigrants in 1966. When the Cubans are excluded, the average annual immigration for 1966-68 was about 347,000 persons.) But most significant has been the relative and absolute decline in the number of European immigrants and the phenomenial increase of Asian migration to the United States. In the early 1960s an average of 21,000 Asians immigrated to the United States annually. Currently about 150,000 Asian immigrants are admitted to the United States annually, an increase of about 600 percent (Asians comprised 35 percent of the recent total immigration to the United States). With the exception of Japan, the impact of the 1965 Immigration Act was to substantially increase immigration from all Asian countries, though numbers and percentages differ for each country and time period. The upward trend in Asian immigration has continued throughout the 1970s. Immigration from North America and South America though showing a numerical increase, decreased in relative terms from their 1961-65 figure. Lastly, we note slight increases of immigrants from Africa and Oceania, though these increases are numerically small.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Changes in the Distribution by Type of Visa among Asian Immigrants

In addition to the abolition of the infamous national origins quota system, the changes in immigration priorities dictated by the Immigration Act of 1965, with emphasis on family reunification and scarce occupational skills, has affected the regional distribution of immigration by changing the criteria under

which persons are granted immigrant status.

Prior to the reforms of the 1965 Act, only those exempt from the quota system (except for the token quotas of a few hundred) by being an immediate relative of a U.S. citizen were eligible for entry to the U.S. It is therefore not too surprising that most of the small numbers of Asian immigrants came from countries where U.S. armed forces were stationed (Taiwan, Korea, Philippines, Japan). In such places, marriages between American soldiers and Asian women were not uncommon.

After 1965, there were two channels of immigration, those exempt from numerical limitation (immediate relatives, spouses, parents, children below age 21, of U.S. citizens) and those subject to the 170,000 annual maximum of the preference system, of which there were four basic categories: Relatives (Preferences 1, 2, 4, 5), Occupational (Preferences 3 and 6), Refugees (Preferences 7), Nonpreferences (Preference 8). Table 3 shows the total numbers of immigrants by type of visa for both transition period (1966-68) and three subsequent three-year periods (1969-71, 1972-74, 1975-77) for the Eastern Hemisphere as a whole and for Asia by specific countries.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

In every period, the numbers of immigrants from the Eastern Hemisphere who were immediate relatives of U.S. citizens (those exempt from the numerical limitations) substantially outnumbered those arriving through the preference system. For instance, in the most recent period, 1975-77 period, three-quarters of a million immigrants were in the "exempt" category, but less than one-half a million arrived through the preference system (maximum of 170,000 per year). The ratio of 60 percent "exempt" to 40 percent "preference" has been fairly

consistent for the entire period since 1965.

In contrast, over 70 percent of Asian immigrants during the 1970s have been admitted under the preference system. In fact, the proportion of immigrants arriving under the "immediate relative of U.S. citizen" criteria has declined for several countries, including China (mostly from Taiwan), Japan, and Korea. The reason for this relative decline, notably for Japan and Korea is the lesser importance of GI brides as a source of Asian immigrants. For the Philippines, there has been a faster growth under the "immediate relatives of U.S. citizens" criteria than for the preference system. This would indicate an advanced stage of a family process of immigration, with a large number of Filipino immigrants having already achieved U.S. citizen status.

In the early years after the 1965 Act, occupational preferences were less frequently used for Asian immigrants than relative preferences under the Preference system. However, occupational preferences were the key methods for Korean, Indian, and Japanese immigration. But as the 1970s progressed, more Asians from all countries becam eligible for family reunification immigration as immediate relatives of resident aliens or as brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. By the late 1970s, more Asian immigrants arrived under the relative preference criteria than the occupational preference criteria for every single country. More than any other Asian group, Koreans have been able to develop this family-chain pattern of migration and fully utilize the Relative Preference category. Whereas in the transition period only 10 percent of Korean immigrants (under the Preference System) entered the United States under the Relative Preference category, now about 50 percent of the Koreans fall under this category. One aspect without any clear explanation is the large number of non-preference immigrants from India (25%) and Japan (15%)--applicants not entitled to any other preferences, but were admitted because the 170,000 overall maximum for the Eastern Hemisphere was

not reached.

Demographic Composition of Asian Immigrants

With the enormous increase in Asian immigration during the last decade, it seems that the composition of immigrants has changed, and therefore their likely impact on U.S. society. In particular, we might ask whether there has been a shift from a small influx of dependents, such as wives of servicemen and their relatives to greater numbers of young and older dependents both male and female. One way to partially address this question is to examine changes in the demographic composition of Asian immigrants over the past 17 years. This inquiry is sharply limited by the availability of published data in the INS reports. Marital status, a key variable in the immigration process, is not cross-classified by age nor is it available by country of origin. Age and sex are the only two demographic variables that are available for a trend analysis by specific countries. Additionally, the ten-year age categories include the 10-19 age group, a most unfortunate category that includes young adolescent dependents and 18 and 19 year olds, who are old enough to marry and enter to the labor force.

With these limitations Table 4 presents the age composition and percent female of each age category for all immigrants, all Asian immigrants, and specific Asian countries, for selected intervals from 1961-65 to 1975-77. The age categories were grouped into a functional classification of 0-9, youthful dependents, 10-29, young adults, 30-49, middle age adults, and 50 and above, older dependents.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

For all immigrants and Asia as a whole, there has been remarkably little change in age composition from the early 1960s to the middle 1970s, in spite of the major changes in the numbers of immigrants. In fact, except for a slight

increase in older dependents, there have only been minor fluctuations in the age composition of all immigrants. For Asia as a whole, there have been slight gains of a few percentage points among youthful (0-9) and older (50 and above) dependents, and a slight relative reduction among middle-age adults. But the changes are so small that we are reluctant to attach any strong interpretation.

For specific countries, it is possible to detect some clearer trends. There has been a small but steady trend towards a higher proportion of young adults (age 10-29) from China (Taiwan, Hong Kong). This might reflect an increasing number of foreign students who "adjust" their visas to immigrant status.

Increases in proportions of young dependents (India, Korea since 1966-68) and older dependents (India since 1966-68, Korea, and especially the Philippines) suggests an increasing process of family immigration and reunification--one of the major objectives of the 1965 Act.

Sex composition, measured by the percent female of each age group, is shown in the second panel of Table 4. Around 53-55 percent of all immigrants to the U.S. are women and this figure has not changed from before the 1965 reforms. Within age groups, women outnumbered men among the young adults (10-29) and among older dependents (50 and above). The same general patterns hold for the all Asia immigrants populations, except that the proportion female in the young and middle age categories has declined about 10 percentage points from the early 1960s.

The drop in female dominance among young and middle age adults is most notable for immigrants from China, Japan, and Korea, though women are still the majority of immigrants in this age category. In contrast, the fraction of women from India has increased over the years. Unlike other countries in East Asia, immigration from India has been primarily male, especially in the middle-aged adult category. But the trend towards increasing numbers of Indian women

immigrants suggests a family process of immigration is becoming more typical.

Both the absolute rise in Asian immigrants and the increasing fraction of males in the adult years are indicators of growing participation of Asians in the U.S. labor force. It also seems reasonable to assume that a greater fraction of female immigrants will enter the labor force. Asian women married to ex-American soldiers would seem less likely to be employed than single women or women married to immigrant husbands. This interpretation is not based upon the attitudes of husbands, but the fact that family enterprises, very common among immigrants, provide employment opportunities for many immigrant women. In the next section, we consider the occupational patterns of Asian immigrants.

Occupational Distribution of Asian Immigrants

This discussion of the occupational distribution of the Asian immigrants is severely constrained by the lack of detailed tabulations of the occupational composition of immigrants. The INS reports do not publish occupational distribution of immigrants by sex or age. Unfortunately, without basic demographic controls, trends in the data must be subject to modest interpretation.

Table 5 presents data on the proportion of immigrants who report having a job and a summary occupational distribution only for those who report having a job. These data are reported for all immigrants, for all Asian immigrants, and for selected Asian countries for selected periods from 1961-65 to 1975-77. For ease of comparison, adjacent panels present the ratios of the occupational percentages of each country to the all immigrants percentages.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

From the early 1960s to the middle 1970s, the proportion of immigrants reporting an occupation dropped from 46 percent to 40 percent. The obvious

interpretation would be that this represents an increase in nonworking dependents as a result of the new emphasis on family reunification. This may be true, but it must be qualified that previous data (Table 4) showed little change in the age and sex composition of all immigrants. For all Asian immigrants, there was an increase of more than 10 percentage points in those reporting an occupation from the pre-reform days of the early 1960s to the post-reform period of 1969-71 period. From this level, the proportion of Asian immigrants reporting an occupation has declined a few points in the 1970s. It seems that the reforms in immigration law allowed Asians to be considered for occupational preferences and thus raised the proportion of immigrants destined for the labor force, but as family ties led to further immigration, the proportion with stated occupations decreased. It should be noted that these data are measured in the visa applications for immigration and do not necessarily represent post-immigration labor force status.

Considering specific Asian countries, there were great differences in the proportion reporting an occupation in the early 1960s, ranging from almost 60 percent among Indians to only 10 percent among Koreans and Japanese. During the late 1960s, the proportions with labor force attachments rose significantly (for the Philippines from 25 to 45 percent). Then during the 1970s, the proportion of dependents increased (except for China, which held steady). At the present time, the only Asian countries that are distinctive from all immigrants are India with a higher than average labor force participation and Korea with a substantially lower figure.

Turning to the occupational levels of those with an occupation, we note that the occupational distribution of Asian immigrants are quite different from the general population, Asian immigrants are much more likely to be professional and technical workers than immigrants from elsewhere--about twice as likely. The most extreme case is India, which had almost 90 percent professionals (of those

reporting an occupation) in the 1969-71 period. The figure is down to 75 percent in 1975-77, but this is still triple the average proportion. The proportion of immigrants who reported professional occupations has declined for all Asian countries during the 1970s, but still remains very high for the Philippines and Korea.

As large scale immigration from Asia continues, the occupational composition appears to have become more broadly based with proportional increases among managerial workers, sales/clerical workers, and even blue collar workers (especially for Korea). There is also a shift toward service workers in the relatively small Japanese stream and of private household workers among Filipinos. Asian immigrants are still very selective compared to all immigrants, but the wide gap has narrowed somewhat in the mid to late 1970s.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As past studies (Boyd, 1971; 1974; Keely, 1971; 1974; 1975a; 1975b) have shown, the major impact of the 1965 Immigration Act was to open the door to Asian immigration. In updating the results of these earlier studies, we note that trends through the late 1970s indicate a continuing increase of Asian immigration to the United States--especially of immigrants from Korea and the Philippines. Currently about 35 percent of all immigration to the United States is from Asia, an increase of 500 percent in the relative share and more than 700 percent in absolute numbers.

Asian immigrants have made good use of both the preference system, which has emphasized family ties and occupational skills, and also the exemption from numerical limits channel for immediate relatives of U.S. citizens. A greater percentage of Asian immigrants in the preference system are now utilizing the "relative preference" category than during earlier periods. A family-chain pattern

of migration among Asian immigrants seems to be developing. Underscoring this trend is the increase in recent figures from previous time periods in the percentage of Asian dependent children and dependent adults immigrating to the United States.

The occupational status of the immigrants has become more diverse over the years. Though the percentage of Asians who were entering the labor force in a professional capacity are still about twice as common as in the general immigrant population, there is an increasing share of other white collar and blue collar workers. This seems understandable as the base of immigration becomes broader and family ties are used to bring in additional relatives.

Reviewing the background of the new Asian immigration to the United States during the last decade and describing the changes in the numbers and characteristics of immigrants from specific Asian countries relative to other immigrants, especially since 1965, raises a number of significant questions for future research on Asian immigration and the new Asia immigrants.

One area of research concerns the hypothesis that this recent influx has resulted in the expansion or growth of Asian American neighborhoods or settlements. Impressionistic observations indicate that this may be the case. Within the last ten years, we have noted the development of several new Asian enclaves or communities--the Koreans in Los Angeles and Chicago and the Vietnamese in certain midwestern towns, and also a resurgence of growth of indigenous Asian communities (i.e., the expansion of the original Chinatown and the development of a "new Chinatown" in another sector of San Francisco). But because Asian immigrants are largely white collar, especially in the professional occupations, they may be less concentrated into immigrant enclaves and more geographically dispersed than other recent immigrant communities. This an important

question that will undoubtedly have a great effect upon subsequent assimilation or segregation of Asian immigrants. Future research should consider such issues as (1) Is the population of various Asian communities actually expanding or is this visible expansion more a product of differential modes of socioeconomic advancement (i.e., the development of ethnic restaurants in other parts of town to attract a wider range of customers and lessen the economic competition within the ethnic community)? (2) What are the characteristics of the new immigrants residing in the ethnic enclave? How do they differ from Asian immigrants living outside the ethnic enclaves? (3) Are Asian professional immigrants different from other immigrants in the residence patterns and their adaption to American society? (4) What sort of involvement (if any) do these new Asian immigrant professionals have with the ethnic enclaves? Are they a source of leadership or are they uninvolved?

Another related question to whether the increase in the influx of Asian immigration will promote the development and expansion of ethnic organizations--organizations which cater to the needs and specific problems of these new immigrants. Such organizations may take the form of English and citizenship classes, career and employment centers, occupational training centers, and legal aid services, especially those dealing with legal aspects of immigration and government bureaucracies. Traditional ethnic organizations such as the clan organizations, whose power and influence in the past have declined, may undergo a revitalization in its influence and power as hew immigrants attempt to construct some sense of order, identity, and community in this strange land. However, if the Asian immigrant is dispersed because of their occupational status, then it is quite possible that the revitalization process of traditional ethnic organizations may not be occurring. It would be interesting to know: (1) Are ethnic organization being developed to cater to the needs of the immigrants and if so, what types of organizations are

being developed? (2) Are traditional ethnic organizations undergoing a revitalization process or are immigrants utilizing different mechanisms for adjustment.

A third area for further research concerns the occupational status of Asian immigrants. Because of the emphasis on scarce occupational skills in the 1965 Immigration Act, a disproportionate amount of Asian immigrants are entering the labor force as professionals. The question which may be asked is: Is the Asian professional distribution similar to that of the general population or do they occupy special occupational niches in specific sectors of the American economy. A related issue is the employment patterns of other family members, especially those who had not planned to work outside the home. The maintenance of a middle-class life style may dictate labor market activity. The impact for the larger society of Asian immigrant participation in the secondary labor market would be an area worth investigating.

Another area of investigation may be the impact this tremendous influx of Asian immigrants may have on racial and ethnic relations in the United States. It may be hypothesized that because of the high degree of professionalism among Asian immigrants a fading effect (though not elimination) of past sterotypes of Asians as coolie laborers, laundrymen, restaurant workers, houseboys, and gardeners will result. On the other hand, Asian professionals may be seen as "pseudo-professionals"--employed in institutions that American professionals avoid (inner city hospitals). Further research is needed to ascertain if as a result of the changes in the characteristics of recent Asian immigrants, there has been changes in Asian sterotypes. The sheer influx of Asian immigrants within recent years will increase their visibility within American society. Further research is needed to ascertain the response of the dominant American society to this new Asian influx and visibility, noting any variations in the race relations situation

between Asians and whites, especially during recent times of economic instability. Such areas of study may deal with (1) cases of conflict between Americans and immigrants as a result of economic competition, (2) current sterotypes of Asian Americans, and (3) interaction patterns between Asians and whites in selected cities or states.

A last area of future research may deal with traditional social problems than continue to plague Asian American communities (Wong, 1977; Owan, 1975; Kim, 1978). In both west and east coast cities, housing shortages, substandard and crowded living conditions, and the lack of adequate medical care and facilities are present in many Asian ghettos. No doubt, many of these social problems existed before the tremendous influx of Asians. The questions that may be entertained are: (1) How extensive, relative to the general population, are the social problems among the various Asian American communities? (2) Are there any underlying themes which tie the various Asian communities together in terms of consequences of the social problem? (3) Are the social problems in Asian American communities documented by recent research a product of the new Asian influx, excerbated by the Asian influx, or existed before the Asian influx but made more public as more studies on the Asian communities are being conducted?

With the limitations of the published data, we have measured a very real revolution in Asian migration to the United States as a result of the 1965 Immigration Act. It remains for future research to investigate the processes of adaption, acculturation, or ethnic segmentation that these new Asian immigrants encounter in American society during the 1970s and 1980s.

Footnote

1. The transition period lasted from December 1965 to June 1968, a period of 31 months. But the data are only published for fiscal years (July 1 to June 30), so our figures are for the 36 month period.

REFERENCES

Boyd, Monica
1971 "Oriental immigration: the experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino population in the United States." International Migration Review, 5(Spring):48-60.

1974 "The changing nature of the central and southeast Asian immigration to the United States: 1961-1972." International Migration Review,8(Winter):507-520.

Burma, John H.
1951 "The background of the current Filipino situation." Social Forces, 30(October):42-48.

Christiansen, John
1979 "The split labor market theory and Filipino exclusion: 1929-1934." Phylon, 50(March):1:66-74.

Daniels, Roger
1970 The Politics of Prejudice. New York: Antheneum.

Daniels, Roger and Harry Kitano
1970 American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Hune, Shirley
1977 Pacific Migration to the United States: Trends and Themes in Historical and Sociological Literature. Research Institute on Immigration and Ethnic Studies, Bibliographical Studies No. 2. Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D.C.

Keeley, Charles
1971 "Effects of the Immigration Act of 1965 on selected population characteristics of immigrants to the U.S." Demography, 8 (May):157-169.

1974 "The demographic effects of immigration legislation and procedures." Interpreter Releases, 51(April 3):89-93.

1975a "Effects of U.S. immigration laws on manpower characteristics of immigrants." Demography, 12(May):179-192.

1975b "Immigration composition and population policy," in Population: Dynamics, Ethnics, and Policy. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Kim, Bok-Lim
1978 "Problems and service needs of Asian Americans in Chicago: an empirical study." Amerasia, 5:2:23-44.

Kung, S.W.
1962 Chinese in American Life. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lyman, Stanford
1974 Chinese Americans. New York: Random House.

Owan, Tom
1975 "Asian Americans: a case of benighted neglest." Asian American Mental Health Research Center, Occasional Paper No. 1.

Sandmeyer, Elmer C.
1973 The Anti-Chinese Movement in California. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Saxton, Alexander
1971 The Indispensible Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California. Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press.

U. S. Bureau of the Census
1973 Census of the Population, 1970. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population. Part 1. U.S. Summary. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

1975 Historical Statistics of the United States. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice
1961- Annual Report: Immigration and Naturalization Service.
1977 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wong, Morrison
1977 "Asian Americans: a case of benign neglect." Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Convention, Sacramento, California.

TABLE 1

PREFERENCE SYSTEM, IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

(1) First preference: Unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.
Not more than 20%.

(2) Second preference: Spouse and unmarried sons and daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.
20% plus any not required for first preference.

(3) Third preference: Members of the professions and scientists and artists of exceptional ability.
Not more than 10%.

(4) Fourth preference: Married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.
10% plus any not required for first three preferences.

(5) Fifth preference: Brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.
24% plus any not required for first four preferences.

(6) Sixth preference: Skilled and unskilled workers in occupations for which labor is in short supply in U.S.
Not more than 10%.

(7) Seventh preference: Refugees to whom conditional entry or adjustment of status may be granted.
Not more than 6%.

(8) Nonpreference: Any applicant not entitled to one of the above preferences.
Any numbers not required for preference applicants.

Source: Report of the Visa Office, 1968, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, p. 68., in Keeley, 1975a.

TABLE 2 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF LEGAL IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES BY REGION OF BIRTH FOR SELECTED PERIODS, 1961-1977[a]

	Average Annual Number (000) of Immigrants					Percentage Distribution For Each Period				
	1961-1965	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977	1961-1965	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977
Europe	122	133	110	88	72	42	35	30	22	17
Asia	21	54	89	125	147	8	14	24	32	35
China[b]	5	20	19	22	24	23	38	21	18	16
India	1	4	10	14	17	3	8	11	11	12
Japan	4	4	4	5	4	18	7	4	4	3
Korea	2	3	10	23	30	9	7	11	18	20
Philippines	3	11	27	31	36	15	22	30	25	24
Other Asia	7	10	19	30	36	32	20	21	24	24
					[c]					[d]
Africa	3	4	7	6	8	1	1	2	2	2
Oceania	1	2	3	3	4	1	1	1	1	1
North America	119	165	134	150	159	41	44	37	38	38
South America	24	21	22	21	26	8	6	6	5	6
Total	290	380	367	393	416					

Notes: a. Slight differences due to rounding error.
b. Includes Taiwan and Hong Kong.
c. Number for specific Asian countries.
d. Percentages of total Asian population.

Source: U. S. Department of Justice. Annual Report: Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1961 to 1977.

TABLE 3 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRANTS BY TYPE OF VISA FOR EASTERN HEMISPHERE AND ASIAN COUNTRIES (BIRTHPLACE OR COUNTRY OF CHARGEABILITY) FOR SELECTED REGIONS, 1966-1977[a]

	Total Number (000)				Percent of All Immigrants			
	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977
Eastern Hemisphere								
Exempt From Num. Limit	704	614	690	750	62	56	58	60
Preference System	436	488	490	497	38	44	42	40
Relative	203	267	270	316	18	24	23	25
Occupation	63	100	89	77	6	9	8	6
Refugee	20	26	29	30	2	2	2	2
Non-Pref.	150	95	102	73	13	9	9	6
Asia								
Exempt From Num. Limit	61	82	114	134	39	30	30	30
Preference System	95	192	262	306	61	70	70	70
Relative	48	86	121	200	31	31	32	45
Occupation	38	64	66	58	24	23	18	13
Refugee	6	1	10	11	4	--	3	2
Non-Pref.	3	40	64	37	2	15	17	8
China[b]								
Exempt From Num. Limit	21	16	12	15	36	28	18	21
Preference System	38	41	54	58	64	72	82	79
Relative	22	22	26	44	38	39	39	60
Occupation	9	10	7	7	16	18	11	10
Refugee	6	1	8	4	10	2	12	5
Non-Pref.	1	8	13	4	2	14	20	5
India								
Exempt From Num. Limit	2	1	4	3	15	3	9	6
Preference System	10	29	39	49	85	97	91	94
Relative	2	5	16	22	15	17	37	42
Occupation	8	9	10	14	70	30	23	27
Refugee	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-Pref.	--	14	14	13	1	47	33	25
Japan								
Exempt From Num. Limit	8	13	9	6	71	72	60	46
Preference System	3	5	6	7	29	28	40	54
Relative	1	2	3	3	11	11	20	23
Occupation	2	2	2	2	17	11	13	15
Refugee	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-Pref.	--	1	2	2	--	6	13	15
Korea								
Exempt From Num. Limit	6	13	21	31	63	43	30	34
Preference System	4	17	48	59	37	57	70	66
Relative	1	6	23	46	10	20	33	51
Occupation	3	5	10	11	27	17	14	12
Refugee	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-Pref.	--	6	16	3	--	20	23	3
Philippines								
Exempt From Num. Limit	12	22	35	48	34	27	38	44
Preference System	22	59	58	60	66	73	62	56
Relative	12	27	27	41	36	33	29	38
Occupation	10	31	31	19	30	38	33	18
Refugee	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-Pref.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes: a. Slight differences due to rounding error.
b. Includes Taiwan and Hong Kong.

Source: Same as Table 2.

TABLE 4 AGE AND SEX COMPOSITION OF ALL IMMIGRANTS AND FROM ASIAN COUNTRIES (BIRTHPLACE) FOR SELECTED PERIODS, 1961-1977[a]

Age	Percentage Distribution					Percent Female of Distribution				
	1961-1965	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977	1961-1965	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977
All Immigrants										
0-9	17	17	18	17	15	49	49	49	50	50
10-29	49	44	46	49	47	59	60	56	55	54
30-49	25	27	28	25	25	52	54	50	51	51
50+	9	12	9	9	13	59	59	57	59	60
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	55	56	53	53	53
N (000)	1450	1139	1102	1180	1247					
All Asia										
0-9	14	15	16	17	17	54	50	50	51	51
10-29	49	44	47	49	47	65	58	61	61	57
30-49	28	32	31	27	24	63	49	48	50	51
50+	9	10	6	8	11	50	58	57	60	60
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	62	54	55	56	55
N (000)	108	156	270	376	440					
China[b]										
0-9	10	14	13	12	12	53	48	48	48	47
10-29	40	39	43	46	48	65	54	59	58	54
30-49	28	32	32	28	25	55	44	44	45	48
50+	22	15	12	15	15	45	59	57	58	56
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	57	51	52	53	52
N (000)	24	59	56	66	73					
India										
0-9	9	11	14	16	14	56	51	49	51	50
10-29	51	51	51	53	53	45	46	46	55	51
30-49	33	35	34	28	28	32	26	27	36	38
50+	6	2	2	2	5	51	46	46	55	57
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	42	40	40	49	48
N (000)	3	12	30	43	52					
Japan										
0-9	10	9	9	10	10	50	55	50	52	47
10-29	50	43	50	51	48	89	79	79	74	64
30-49	35	41	36	34	36	91	79	75	72	65
50+	5	7	5	5	6	52	66	66	73	75
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84	76	74	71	64
N (000)	19	11	13	15	13					
Korea										
0-9	30	19	20	25	28	66	64	59	57	56
10-29	54	50	49	43	44	87	83	78	70	66
30-49	15	28	28	27	22	71	55	52	50	52
50+	1	2	3	5	6	67	72	62	64	62
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	78	71	66	61	60
N (000)	10	10	30	70	90					
Philippines										
0-9	12	16	19	19	14	49	50	49	49	49
10-29	52	42	44	45	45	65	62	63	63	61
30-49	31	35	31	26	21	72	56	58	62	62
50+	5	7	6	10	20	68	56	58	64	63
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	65	58	59	60	60
N (000)	16	34	80	93	108					

Notes: a. Slight differences due to rounding error.
b. Includes Taiwan and Hong Kong.

Source: Same as Table 2.

TABLE 5 PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRANTS WITH OCCUPATION, OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION, AND RATIO OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION FROM ASIA AND SELECTED ASIAN COUNTRIES, 1961-1977[a]

	Percent of All Immigrants					Ratio of Occupation Distribution of Each Country to Total				
	1961-1965	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977	1961-1965	1966-1968	1969-1971	1972-1974	1975-1977
All Immigrants										
% with Occupation	46	43	42	39	40					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	20	25	29	27	25					
Manager	5	5	4	6	8					
Clerical/Sales	21	15	10	10	13					
Blue Collar	33	32	37	36	36					
Service	7	8	7	11	9					
Private Household	7	11	8	6	4					
Farm	6	5	5	4	4					
Asia										
% with Occupation	31	35	43	38	37					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	40	52	52	54	44	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.8
Manager	9	6	5	8	11	1.8	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4
Clerical/Sales	17	10	8	10	13	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.0
Blue Collar	18	22	12	14	17	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.5
Service	12	11	6	8	7	1.7	1.4	0.9	0.7	0.8
Private Household	2	3	3	3	4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	1.0
Farm	2	4	3	2	3	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.8
China[b]										
% with Occupation	36	41	41	41	41					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	31	35	47	37	31	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.2
Manager	17	9	7	11	17	3.4	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.1
Clerical/Sales	13	11	11	12	15	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.2	1.2
Blue Collar	16	19	16	18	21	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6
Service	21	22	15	12	12	3.0	7.8	2.1	1.1	1.3
Private Household	2	3	4	1	1	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.2
Farm	1	2	--	1	2	0.2	0.4	--	0.2	0.5
India										
% with Occupation	58	59	58	50	48					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	68	67	89	84	73	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.1	2.9
Manager	4	2	2	4	8	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.0
Clerical/Sales	16	5	4	5	8	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
Blue Collar	5	3	3	4	7	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Service	4	1	1	2	2	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Private Household	1	1	--	1	--	0.1	0.1	--	0.2	--
Farm	3	1	1	--	2	0.5	0.2	0.2	--	0.5
Japan										
% with Occupation	10	23	26	29	35					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	44	50	45	37	28	2.2	2.0	1.6	1.4	1.1
Manager	7	7	8	11	19	1.4	1.4	2.0	1.8	2.4
Clerical/Sales	22	15	17	16	15	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.6	1.2
Blue Collar	11	10	9	11	11	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3
Service	8	9	12	21	24	1.1	1.1	1.7	1.9	2.7
Private Household	2	6	5	2	2	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.5
Farm	6	4	4	1	1	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.2
Korea										
% with Occupation	11	25	28	27	26					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	71	75	70	51	38	3.6	3.0	2.4	1.9	1.5
Manager	4	4	5	12	13	0.8	0.8	1.2	2.0	1.6
Clerical/Sales	14	8	7	4	14	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.1
Blue Collar	4	5	10	20	25	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.7
Service	6	5	4	7	6	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Private Household	--	3	3	2	1	--	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2
Farm	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	0.2	0.5
Philippines										
% with Occupation	25	45	46	41	42					
% of Total With Occupation										
Professional	48	60	70	63	47	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	1.9
Manager	3	2	2	5	7	0.6	0.4	1.2	0.8	0.9
Clerical/Sales	12	7	7	10	14	0.6	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.1
Blue Collar	13	11	8	7	12	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3
Service	15	6	3	3	4	2.1	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.4
Private Household	5	5	4	8	11	0.7	0.5	0.5	1.3	2.8
Farm	4	10	6	4	6	0.7	2.0	0.8	1.0	1.5

Notes: a. Slight differences due to rounding error.
b. Includes Taiwan and Hong Kong.

Source: Same as Table 2.

FIGURE 1

ANNUAL NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS FROM SELECTED EUROPEAN AND ASIAN COUNTRIES FROM 1961 TO 1977